



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/531,896

04/21/2005

Yasufumi Asao

03500.017697.

5799

5514

7590

09/30/2010

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO

1290 Avenue of the Americas

NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER

JOSEPH, DENNIS P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/30/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,896	Applicant(s) ASAO ET AL.	
	Examiner DENNIS P. JOSEPH	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,7-9 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,7-9 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/21/2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/16/2010</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to amendments for No. 10/531,896 filed on July 12, 2010. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7-9 and 21 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. **Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7-9 and 21** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-David et al. (US 2004/0174389 A1) in view of Abileah et al. (US 5,499,126)

Ben-David teaches in Claim 1:

A color display element comprising a unit pixel which is comprised of a plurality of sub-pixels comprising a first sub-pixel and a second sub-pixel, the second sub-pixel having a green

Art Unit: 2629

color filter (**Figures 12A/12B, [0085]-[0087] disclose RGB sub-pixels in row A with a corresponding CMY sub-pixels in row B. It is designed so that the G sub-pixel corresponds to the M sub-pixel. For purposes of interpretation, please read the first sub-pixel as the magenta sub-pixel and the second sub-pixel as the green sub-pixel. Also, please see various disclosures in Ben-David with regards to the filters on the sub-pixels),**

wherein the color display element has a means of applying a voltage to each of the sub-pixels (**Respectfully, this is obvious in a voltage driven display such as an LCD. [0059] discloses that the transmittance (related to intensity level) is dependent on the voltage applied o the sub-pixels),**

modulated in accordance with a voltage applied to the first sub-pixel in a range within which a brightness of light passing through the liquid crystal layer is variable and in a range to display chromatic colors assumed by light passing through the liquid crystal layer, the chromatic colors including red and blue but not including green (**As discussed above, modulation by applying a voltage is suggested in [0059] and again, is obvious in an LCD. Differences in voltages account for differences in brightness, at least in part. As for the range of chromatic colors for this first sub-pixel, it is well known that magenta is represented as red and blue (hence why it corresponds to the green sub-pixel as a pair, so they can make white). Thus, this sub-pixel is capable of red and blue color outputs. Also, please note that chromatic and achromatic colors and being able to produce at these boundaries is capable given Ben-David's CIE charts, such as Figures 5A/5B), and**

second sub-pixel with the green color filter is modulated in accordance with a voltage applied to the second sub-pixel in a range within which a brightness of light passing through the

Art Unit: 2629

liquid crystal layer is variable and the light is achromatic. (**As discussed above, modulation by applying a voltage is suggested in [0059] and again, is obvious in an LCD. Differences in voltages account for differences in brightness, at least in part. The second sub-pixel is the green sub-pixel as noted above. Also, please note that chromatic and achromatic colors and being able to produce at these boundaries is capable given Ben-David's CIE charts, such as Figures 5A/5B); but**

Ben-David also does not explicitly teach of the liquid crystal layer having a retardation capability.

However, in liquid crystal displays, it is obvious, if not inherent, that the LCD layer is deformed (read as retarded) with respect to the molecules when a voltage is applied to it. Respectfully, this is standard in a liquid crystal display.

To emphasize, in the same field of endeavor, liquid crystal panels, Abileah teaches of using a retardation means in various areas of his disclosure. For example, please see the abstract where he summarizes and states that for each of the RGB subpixels, there is a retardation film for each subpixel. Furthermore, he discloses in Column 13, Lines 37-45, he at least suggests the LCD layer is applied with a voltage, thereby obviously, if not inherently, retarding the layer and the molecules in response to the application of voltage. Also, please note that Abileah's invention is a twisted nematic LCD, which are even more concerned with the deformation of the LCD layer than other types. Several KSR principles can be applied here, such as known technique (the

Art Unit: 2629

retarding of the LCD layer is well known when applying voltages to effect color changes in the pixels), simple substitution of parts (being able to implement a known driving technique with destroying the combination), teaching/suggestion/motivation in the prior arts (the retardation suggestions by Abileah), etc.

Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the retardation technique to the layer, as taught by Abileah, with Ben-David's invention, with the motivation of the KSR principles above and that by doing so, color leakages can be eliminated, resulting in a better image, (Abileah, Column 18, Lines 1-13).

Ben-David and Abileah teach in Claim 4:

The color display element according to claim 1, wherein a voltage making the light passing through the liquid crystal layer assume magenta is applied to the first sub-pixel, and a voltage making the light passing through the liquid crystal layer assume a maximum brightness of green is applied to the second sub-pixel, whereby the unit pixel displays white color. **(Figures 12/12B and [0085] disclose that when the first and second sub-pixel are vertically paired, they can produce white light. Obviously, this is at a maximum brightness/gray scale application)**

Ben-David teaches in Claim 5:

The color display element according to claim 1, wherein the first sub-pixel has a magenta color filter. **(Figures 12A/12B and for purposes of interpretation, the first sub-pixel is a**

Art Unit: 2629

magenta. Also, please see various disclosures in Ben-David with regards to the filters on the sub-pixels)

Ben-David teaches in Claim 7:

The color display element according to claim 5, wherein a voltage in the range within which the chromatic color changes is applied to the first sub-pixel, to display a color as a result of overlapping the chromatic color and a color of the magenta color filter with each other. (**Figures 12/12B and [0085] disclose that when the first and second sub-pixel are vertically paired, they can produce white light. This satisfies the limitation of requiring an overlap of the two sub-pixels to form a color)**

Ben-David teaches in Claim 8:

The color display element according to claim 5, wherein a voltage making the lights passing through the liquid crystal layers have a maximum brightness in the range within which a brightness of the light is variable is applied to the first and second sub-pixels, whereby the unit pixel displays white color. (**The same reasoning that applies to Claim 4 also applies here. Figures 12/12B and [0085] disclose that when the first and second sub-pixel are vertically paired, they can produce white light. Obviously, this is at a maximum brightness/gray scale application)**

Ben-David teaches in Claim 9:

Art Unit: 2629

The color display element according to claim 5, wherein modulations of a same gray level in the range within which a brightness of the light is variable are applied to the first and second sub-pixels respectively, whereby an achromatic color of half tone is displayed in the unit pixel. (**[0085] discloses that white can be displayed by modulating the first and second sub-pixels together. Please note that one of ordinary skill in the art would realize to be able to display achromatic colors and Ben-David suggests doing so given the particular alignment of the various sub-pixels)**

Ben-David teaches in Claim 21:

A method for driving a color display element which contains a liquid crystal layer, a retardation of which changes in accordance with an applied voltage, the color display element being comprised of a unit pixel comprised of a plurality of sub-pixels comprising a first sub-pixel and a second sub-pixel, the second sub-pixel having a green color filter (**Figures 12A/12B, [0085]-[0087] disclose RGB sub-pixels in row A with a corresponding CMY sub-pixels in row B. It is designed so that the G sub-pixel corresponds to the M sub-pixel. For purposes of interpretation, please read the first sub-pixel as the magenta sub-pixel and the second sub-pixel as the green sub-pixel. Also, please see various disclosures in Ben-David with regards to the filters on the sub-pixels as this is part of the LCD array, Abstract)**, which comprises the steps of:

applying to the first sub-pixel a voltage modulating the retardation of the liquid crystal layer in a range within which a brightness of light passing through the liquid crystal layer is variable and in a range to display chromatic colors assumed by light passing through the liquid

Art Unit: 2629

crystal layer, the chromatic colors including red and blue but not including green (**As discussed above, modulation by applying a voltage is suggested in [0059] and again, is obvious in an LCD. Differences in voltages account for differences in brightness, at least in part. As for the range of chromatic colors for this first sub-pixel, it is well known that magenta is represented as red and blue (hence why it corresponds to the green sub-pixel as a pair, so they can make white). Thus, this sub-pixel is capable of red and blue color outputs. Also, please note that chromatic and achromatic colors and being able to produce at these boundaries is capable given Ben-David's CIE charts, such as Figures 5A/5B), and**

applying to the second sub-pixel with the green color filter a voltage modulating the retardation of the liquid crystal layer in a range within which a brightness of light passing through the liquid crystal layer is variable and the light is achromatic. (**As discussed above, modulation by applying a voltage is suggested in [0059] and again, is obvious in an LCD. Differences in voltages account for differences in brightness, at least in part. The second sub-pixel is the green sub-pixel as noted above. Also, please note that chromatic and achromatic colors and being able to produce at these boundaries is capable given Ben-David's CIE charts, such as Figures 5A/5B); but**

Ben-David also does not explicitly teach of the liquid crystal layer having a retardation capability.

Art Unit: 2629

However, in liquid crystal displays, it is obvious, if not inherent, that the LCD layer is deformed (read as retarded) with respect to the molecules when a voltage is applied to it. Respectfully, this is standard in a liquid crystal display.

To emphasize, in the same field of endeavor, liquid crystal panels, Abileah teaches of using a retardation means in various areas of his disclosure. For example, please see the abstract where he summarizes and states that for each of the RGB subpixels, there is a retardation film for each subpixel. Furthermore, he discloses in Column 13, Lines 37-45, he at least suggests the LCD layer is applied with a voltage, thereby obviously, if not inherently, retarding the layer and the molecules in response to the application of voltage. Also, please note that Abileah's invention is a twisted nematic LCD, which are even more concerned with the deformation of the LCD layer than other types. Several KSR principles can be applied here, such as known technique (the retarding of the LCD layer is well known when applying voltages to effect color changes in the pixels), simple substitution of parts (being able to implement a known driving technique with destroying the combination), teaching/suggestion/motivation in the prior arts (the retardation suggestions by Abileah), etc.

Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the retardation technique to the layer, as taught by Abileah, with Ben-David's invention, with the motivation of the KSR principles above and that by doing so, color leakages can be eliminated, resulting in a better image, (Abileah, Column 18, Lines 1-13).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments considered, but are respectfully considered to be moot in grounds of new rejection(s).

Applicant is thanked for the interview to discuss the case and to discuss the differences between the previous rejection and the claimed invention. Due to the discussion and the new/supplemental claim amendments, the previous rejection has been withdrawn and a new one has been given.

Since the primary reference has been changed, Applicant's arguments are respectfully, moot. Examiner will await a response before responding further.

Conclusions

6. Applicant's amendments and non-persuasive arguments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DENNIS P. JOSEPH whose telephone number is (571)270-1459. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on 571-272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Amr Awad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629